

Danner, Ward

From: Jennifer deNicola <jd18@me.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 04, 2014 3:40 PM
To: Wilson, Patrick
Cc: Armann, Steve; Scott, Jeff
Subject: draft (4/28/09)

Dear Patrick:

Thank you for sending the full document. Now that I have had a chance to look at it, I have further questions. I sent you a preliminary set of questions on Jan 9th and again Jan 16th. Would you please take the time to answer these questions.

This document contradicts the EPA Guidance for Acceptable Levels in Schools as well as increases the risk for young children.

From our very first conversations, you shared with me that wipe samples should be non-detect (under .001ug). Yet now that level is .010ug.

Air sample criteria has changed as well from .0043ug, as you told me on our first call, "we would like to see schools at the residential risk level of .0043" and now it's at .2ug, a number that has not been properly vetted based on what you have provided me.

Many PCB experts in the country claim that we should be doing everything we can to remove PCBs from our environment and they have not benefit to be left in place in our schools. They claim that the low end of the EPA's acceptable range puts our kids are risk. Their standards are much lower and their research is more up to date. In addition, looking at PCBs alone without taking into consideration any other contaminates in the classroom bias the results. Toxins in a "cocktail" increases their individual potential to do harm.

If the EPA is bound by congressional policy, then it is the EPA's obligation to give citizens options for best case cleanup and evaluation criteria. The EPA is obligated to do everything in it's power to protect our children. If you have knowledge or information that will help to ensure their safety, then you must provided it all to empower us to make the best decisions for our children and our community.

Please let me know if you would like to discuss the .2ug Draft document on the phone or you can email me answers the questions I emailed you in January. These questions are important and must be addressed.

Thank you,
Jennifer deNicola